



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/043,053	01/08/2002	Gerald Walter Baumann	BLD92000034US2	5397	
28722	7590 09/14/2005		EXAMINER		
BRACEWELL & PATTERSON, L.L.P.			WANG, LIANG-CHE		
P.O. BOX 969 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0969			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2155	2155	
			DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/043,053	BAUMANN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	T	Liang-che Alex Wang	2155			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES IN A COMMENT OF THE MAILING THE	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 January 2002</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) 🗌	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)[✓ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 					
5)[]	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.					
· ·	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau	•	a iii iiio / taiioiiai otago			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attach	*(a)					
Attachmen 1) Notice	n(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice 3) Infor	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 1/8/02, 12/08/03.	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
		, _				

Application/Control Number: 10/043,053 Page 2

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Paper Submitted

- 2. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file:
 - a. Information Disclosure Statements as received on 1/8/2002 and 12/10/2003 are considered.

Specification

- 3. Abstract is too long.
- 4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc

Application/Control Number: 10/043,053

Art Unit: 2155

Double Patenting

Page 3

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 6. Claims 1-27 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-31 of U. S. Patent No. 6,772,217 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.
- 7. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the breadth of the pending independent claims 1, 11 and 19 are covered by the limitation in claims 1, 6 and 7 of '217 patent with the limitation as follow: A method of transmitting data, comprising: initiating transfer of a large data file containing a plurality of segments over a network by transmitting one or more segments of the plurality of segments utilizing a first set of M concurrent data streams, wherein M is one or more, followed by transmitting one or more segments of the plurality of segments utilizing a second set of N concurrent data streams, wherein N>M+1; during transmission utilizing the first set of M concurrent data streams, determining individual

Application/Control Number: 10/043,053

Page 4

Art Unit: 2155

transmission bandwidths for each concurrent data stream of the first set of M concurrent data streams and a first aggregate transmission bandwidth for the first set of M concurrent data streams; during transmission utilizing the second set of N concurrent data streams, determining individual transmission bandwidths for each concurrent data stream of the second set of N concurrent data streams and a second aggregate transmission bandwidth for the second set of N concurrent data streams; comparing the first aggregate transmission bandwidth to the second aggregate transmission bandwidth; and responsive to a determination that the second aggregate transmission bandwidth is greater than the first aggregate transmission bandwidth by a first predetermined threshold, initiating a third set of Z concurrent data streams to transfer a portion of the large data file, wherein Z>N.

8. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Liang-che Alex Wang whose telephone number is
(571)272-3992. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 am
to 5:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/043,053 Page 5

Art Unit: 2155

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Liangche Alex Wang September 8, 2005

SALTHNAJJAR DIMARY EXAMINER